



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 10, 2004

Ms. Linda L. Sjogren  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Angelo  
P. O. Box 1751  
San Angelo, Texas 76902

OR2004-1810

Dear Ms. Sjogren:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197413.

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for a specified "Audio/Video tape." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.103 and 552.119 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The city maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that

it seeks to withhold from disclosure. To meet this burden, the city must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App. – Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103.

In demonstrating that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the city must furnish concrete evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). Conversely, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

You indicate that the city anticipates litigation in this matter because the requestor has filed a complaint with the city police department's Internal Affairs Officer alleging that excessive force was used against her and because she notified the city that she intends to file a claim with the city for medical bills incurred as a result of her arrest. After carefully reviewing your arguments and the submitted videotape, we find that the city has failed to adequately demonstrate that it reasonably anticipated litigation with regard to this matter on the date that it received this request for information. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted videotape under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You also claim that the submitted videotape is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.119 of the Government Code. Section 552.119 excepts from public disclosure a photograph of a peace officer that, if released, would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer unless one of three exceptions applies. The three exceptions are: (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding. This section also provides that a photograph excepted from disclosure under this section may be made public, only if the peace officer gives written consent to the disclosure. In this instance, you have not demonstrated, nor is it apparent from our review of the submitted videotape, that the release of any portion of the videotape would endanger the life or physical safety of any officer depicted in that videotape. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted videotape under section 552.119 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that the submitted videotape includes audio references to several driver's license numbers that may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130(a) excepts from disclosure information that relates to: "(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state; or (3) a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or a local agency authorized to issue an identification document." Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(3). Accordingly, we conclude that the city must withhold these references pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code, but only if the numbers constitute Texas driver's license numbers.

In summary, the city must withhold audio references to driver's license numbers contained in the submitted videotape pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code, but only if the numbers constitute Texas driver's license numbers. In any event, the city must release the remaining portions of the submitted videotape to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the


governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJB/lmt

Ref: ID# 197413

Enc. Submitted videotape

c: Ms. Nichole Kemp  
4401 Southwest Blvd., #219  
San Angelo, Texas 76904  
(w/o enclosure)